

Sing, Spell, Read & Write Level 1 Program for 20 Students

Pearson Education, Inc., publishing as Modern Curriculum Press

Copyright - 2004

ISBN - 0765232421

Edition - 3rd

Grade Level	P2 - 1st Grade
Readability Level	Level 1: 0.0 -3.0
Course / Content	Reading
List Price:	2289.38
Wholesale Price	0

The features of each book or program were developed by the publisher and do not reflect the opinion of the Kentucky State Review Team Kentucky State Textbook Commission or the Kentucky Department of Education.

Content	<p>SSRW Level 1 combines movement and music with carefully sequenced instruction to help students quickly master phonics skills. SSRW also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">" Teaches phonics and decoding concepts through look, listen, point, and sing-along charts, songs, and echo routines." Reaches every child using built-in multimodal teaching strategies." Provides opportunities for building listening, speaking, reading, and writing vocabulary." Assists students in developing fluency and accuracy." Teaches comprehension strategies to build better readers
---------	--

SSRW is also available in Spanish

Student Experiences	<p>Sing, Spell, Read & Write (SSRW) is a unique reading program for all Kindergarten and First Grade children. SSRW uses a multisensory approach that makes learning to read fun. Songs help children remember what they've learned. Games allow for needed repetition and provide a nonthreatening atmosphere to master beginning skills. This program is effective because the method requires total participation. Every student must respond individually to each step in the program. Students take turns playing games, singing songs, and taking part in a wide variety of multisensory activities. Children learn to read as early as kindergarten, and they can achieve complete decoding, fluency, and comprehension skills by the end of the first grade.</p>
---------------------	--

Assessment	<p>Achievement Tests are provided for use with Level 1. These test are instruments that may be utilized at any time during the school year for the purpose of placing new students in the program at their proper level, they should be administered to all SSRW students after completing Step 15 and after completing Raceway Step 36. The purpose of the test is to evaluate student ability and/or progress in reading skills, including: Knowledge of letters, Phonemic awareness, Phonics, Reading vocabulary, Word comprehension, and Sentence comprehension.</p>
------------	--

Organization	<p>SSRW has a unique 36-step system of carefully sequenced instruction that combines music and multimodal teaching strategies that were developed and classroom tested for more than 25 years. SSRW introduces the sound (or phoneme) first, associates it with a key word and then later anchors the sound to a grapheme. For example, the sounds of every letter in the alphabet are first introduced in the "A to Z Phonics Song" by associating the sound with a key word picture cue - i.e. /a/ /a/ apple; /b/ /b/ ball. Once these connections are established, the child then learns the name of the letter that represents the sound and receives repeated practices that integrate the sound,</p>
--------------	--

mnemonic, the letter symbol and the letter name. Once the alphabetic principle is established, children are systematically introduced to more complex sounds, again through song - i.e. ch = /sh/ for Charlotte's chandelier; /sh/ for shell; /oi/ for oil, soil, etc.

SSRW is a systematic phonics program that moves from the part to the whole. Children learn sounds and letters first then they build combinations of sounds and letters, recombine them, blend then into syllables and finally into words. Children move to developing decoding skills once the letter/sound correspondences and linguistic patterns are assimilated.

Resource Materials SSRW Resource Materials include: Teacher's Manuals, Student books, Various vowel, letter, blends charts, 17 Phonetic Story Books, Assessment Book, Desk Strip, Alphabetic Wall Cards, Vowel Cards, Song Cards, various phonetic games, CD of Phonetic Songs, Tr

Gratis Items to be provided and under what conditions 1 Precision Planner CD-ROM with the purchase of the Complete Level 1 Program for 20 Students.

Available Ancillary Materials All materials are included in the classroom kits.

Research Data and Evidence of Effectiveness

Disclaimer: the research data and evidence of effectiveness was provided by the publisher and does not reflect the opinion of the State Review Team, the State Textbook Commission, or the Kentucky Department of Education.

Research Available YES - provide information below
For a complete research paper for SSRW please contact us.

Description of the Study

This study was cited in the National Reading Panel Report. The SSR&W program was implemented in 11 Memphis City Schools. Nine of these schools were randomly selected to participate in the study for the entire school year, and they were divided into socioeconomic strata (high, middle, and low) on the basis of students receiving free lunch. Nine control schools that used a basal reading program were randomly selected. The control schools were matched to the experimental schools based on socioeconomic status, race, and standardized achievement scores. Classes were matched based on size, standardized test scores, and class structure. Class structures were Focused Instructional Program (FIP) (designed specifically for lower achievers) or mixed regular/FIP. Students were given a pre-test and post-test in letter-word identification, word attack, and oral reading.

Results

Results were reported as effect sizes. The strongest effect was in the Kindergarten low-socioeconomic stratum group on the word attack test, where students scored an 8.3 standard deviations higher than the control group on the post-test. Effect sizes were higher for the treatment groups for the other strata as well for word attack, with a strong effect on the high stratum students. All of the Kindergarten treatment groups scored higher than the control groups for the letter-word ID tests also, with strong effects for middle and low strata. Low-socioeconomic stratum students in the treatment group outperformed the control for oral reading.

For first grade, effects favored the SSR&W groups for all strata in all subtests. Extremely strong effects were observed for word attack, with an effect size of over 1.2 for high stratum students and almost 1.0 for the middle stratum. Middle and high stratum students showed strong effects on the letter-word identification subtest.

Second grade students in the treatment groups (who all fell into the middle stratum) scored higher than the control groups in letter-word ID, word attack, and oral reading, with strong effects for letter-word ID and word attack.

Study 2

Description of the Study

A four-week summer school program using SSR&W was implemented in 10 schools in California, involving 51 kindergarten, first, and second grade elementary teachers and 790 schools. Sessions were five days a week for four hours per day. Teachers were trained in the use of the program. Pre- and post-tests were given to students at the beginning and end of the summer session that measured the following (varies by grade): letter sounds, blending, vocabulary, and sentences, beginning sounds, and clusters.

Results

Results are reported using effect sizes that represent the effect of the program in raising student achievement. The effect sizes for overall grade samples are as follows: 0.43 for kindergarten, 0.33 for first grade, and 0.44 for second grade overall. For Limited English Proficient students, the effect size was 0.32 for the K/1 sample, and a very high 1.71 for the second grade. Non-English proficient K/1 students had an effect size of 0.54.

Program Effectiveness with At-Risk Students

Each lesson in the SSR&W teacher's manuals provides flexible strategies for adapting the lessons for English Language Learners and struggling students. These strategies incorporate recommendations from SDAIE (Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English) and CALLA (Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach) in the following ways:

- " Analyze material from children's point of view
- " Provide background experience and personalize the lesson
- " Identify and teach essential vocabulary
- " Present the lesson orally
- " Use a variety of visuals
- " Simplify grammatical structures and paraphrase
- " Reinforce language learning while teaching content
- " Teach study skills textbook aids
- " Use manipulative materials and hands-on activities
- " Monitor children's progress

(See page 10 in Sing, Spell, Read & Write Level 1 Teacher's Manual, page 9 in Level 1 Teacher's Manual.)

The International Reading Association and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (1998) remind us that good teachers bring into play a variety of teaching strategies. Among the most effective of these with young children is the use of music. The relationship between music and language development is supported by a wealth of research (Weinberger, 1995; Lamb & Gregory, 1993; Rauscher et al., 1993; Dowling, 1993; Hanshumacher, 1980; all cited in Jensen, 1998). Music, the research shows, arouses the brain by providing patterning exercises that improve retention. In addition to providing stimulation, "songs encourage a playfulness with language and vocabulary that can spill over into reading-skills development" (Jensen, 1998).

Sing, Spell, Read & Write (SSR&W) brings the impact of this research into the classroom. As the studies reported on above indicate, this program has been getting great

results, in large part through its carefully sequenced instruction that combines music and multimodal teaching strategies. With SSR&W, children learn the sounds and how to blend them into words through songs, colorful posters, and interactive materials. Because the phonological processor is highly attuned to patterns of rhyme, rhythm, and pitch, songs are much easier to learn than intoned lists (Adams, 1990). Beyond that, research has shown that music improves the second stage of learning to read-establishing the correspondence between graphemes and phonemes (Weinberger, 1998).

Sing, Spell, Read & Write is a unique reading program for Pre-Kindergarten through first grade. It uses carefully sequenced, systematic, explicit phonics instruction to build fluent independent readers. Using look, listen, point, sing-along, and echo routines along with gross-motor and fine-motor activities, the program actively engages the senses. In these ways, the program effectively reaches all types of learners.

The program is effective because the method requires total participation. Every student must respond individually to each step in the program. No student will be "left behind." Students take turns playing games (in large and small groups), singing songs, and taking part in a wide variety of activities. Children learn to read as early as kindergarten.

The accompanying Teacher's Manual further enables teachers to reach every student in the class. The Manual states objectives clearly, pictures components for easy preparation, places teacher scripting at the point of use. In every lesson there are activities suggested for English-language learners. For instance, the ESL/ELL activity suggested on page 164 of the SSR&W Teacher's Manual for Level K reads:

ESL/ELL

Invite volunteers to read and act out the sentences on pages 5, 14, 17, 24, and 30 of Peg Can help: Peg went to bed. Ed Fell. Ed yells. Peg helps Ed. Peg met a man. Help children identify the words that have the short e sound.

In addition, for children who need more help, the Additional Resources section in the lesson references two other Modern Curriculum Press programs: Ready Readers-fun-to-read, phonics-based books, and MCP Phonics-a proven phonics program for additional practice.

24. Evidence

Data is included below. Because of the format, charts did not transfer. For a complete Research Compendium, please contact us.

INTRODUCTION The No Child Left Behind Act The 2001 No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Education Act identified five essential components of teaching reading that should be incorporated through explicit and systemic instruction:

Phonemic Awareness;

2. Phonics;

3. Vocabulary Development;

4. Reading Fluency, including oral reading skills; and

5. Reading Comprehension strategies.

These components are to be implemented by state and local educational agencies, using scientifically-based reading research to ensure that every student is reading at grade level or above by the end of third grade. The development of effective instructional materials and programs that can be proven to prevent or remediate reading failure is an important part of the implementation of these policies.

This study was conducted to assess the impact of Pearson Learning Group's Modern Curriculum Press Sing, Spell, Read & Write (SSRW), a beginning reading program, in

the San Francisco Unified School District. The purpose of the study was to examine the effectiveness of the SSRW program as a reading intervention curriculum.

Four-Week Summer School Pilot Program This report examines the impact of the SSRW curriculum in a four-week summer school program conducted during the 2000 academic year. The program was implemented in ten elementary schools, involving 51 kindergarten, first, and second grade elementary teachers and 790 students in the San Francisco Unified School District. The elementary schools involved in the study were: Bryant, Carver, Chavez, Cleveland, Golden Gate, Gordon Lau, Monroe, E. R. Taylor, Visitation Valley, and Webster.

A description of the students by grade level is provided in Table 1. Table 1 Student Classification By Grade Level n 790 Kindergarten 258 First Grade 282 Second Grade 250

A description of the students by English language proficiency status is provided in Table 2: Table 2 Student Classification By English Language Proficiency n 790 Non-English Proficiency 128 Limited English Proficiency 272 English Proficiency 149 Fluent English Proficiency 23 No Language Proficiency Identified 218.

SSRW was the primary curriculum of the summer pilot program. The pilot program was four weeks in duration, with sessions five days a week for four hours a day, providing a total of 80 hours of instruction as the maximum number of hours possible for student participants during the period.

Evaluation Questions Specific evaluation questions were developed to guide the analysis of the San Francisco Unified District Summer School Program. These questions were:

- o What were the achievement outcomes for the kindergarten, first, and second grade student participants across school sites?
- o To what extent was the SSRW curriculum effective for the given varying levels of English Language Proficiency?
- o To what extent was the SSRW curriculum effective across relevant demographic analyses?

THE SSRW CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION Sue Dickson¹, veteran educator and the author of SSRW, designed an integrated program for teaching spoken language, reading, spelling, and writing. The curriculum is a program of carefully sequenced, systematic, explicit phonics instruction to build fluent, independent readers. Implementation of the curriculum employs the use of music and movement with multimodal teaching strategies. Using look, listen, point, sing-along, and echo routines, along with gross motor and fine motor activities, the program actively engages the senses and is designed to be effective for all types of preferred learning styles. The multimodal teaching strategies employed are strongly supported by current research on brain function, language acquisition, and reading.^{2, 3, 4,}

The SSRW Curriculum The SSRW curriculum includes many interactive and multimodal stimuli, including charts, books, audiocassettes, and games. Teachers' manuals are provided to promote consistency in methodology and include lessons, reproducibles, musical scores, and recommendations for relevant follow-up work. In the Level 1 Curriculum, students can chart their progress in the program by using a racecar chart. The program stresses intensive systematic phonics, vocabulary development, comprehension, spelling, and grammar. Lessons use sing-along phonics songs, interactive point-and-learn charts, and motivating practice to move readers to the next skill level.

Program Training of Elementary Teachers Several techniques were used to enhance the pedagogic consistency across school sites. Prior to the summer school implementation, an

eight-hour in-service for teachers was conducted. Each teacher was given the appropriate manual, either kindergarten or first grade, with key parts pre-tabbed for ease of implementation. The trainers provided a mock classroom, showing the setup for the materials, and used student-teacher role-playing techniques to enhance the experience. Each of the program techniques was demonstrated, with any questions regarding implementation addressed.

Teachers were provided with a daily schedule for the 80-hour pilot program as well as a checklist of components. Videos demonstrating each one of the program techniques were shown as the materials were presented. Teachers were coached post-video by individual trainers and given the opportunity to practice.

Once the pilot program began, assistance was provided for all the pretesting, and again for the posttesting process. Consultants visited the classrooms during the summer sessions and, when needed, modeled key techniques for the teachers.

DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS Pretest and posttest scores from the various curriculum areas were calculated and electronically entered into a database, along with the following information:

- o Student identification number
- o Name of the school
- o Name of the teacher
- o Grade level
- o Language proficiency level: English proficient; Limited English proficient; Fluent English; Non-English proficient, and not identified.

Data were analyzed using statistical analysis software. T-tests by grade level and language proficiency level were used to determine the variance between pretest and posttest means and level of significance for each database subset of students. Effect sizes were calculated and a Binomial Effect Size Differential (BESD) provided in tables for each student category findings. A pooled kindergarten and first grade sample was used to increase statistical power for subset analyses because both grades were given the same pretest/posttests. Second grade students were given a different set of pretests and posttests.

Findings are presented in terms of the specific evaluation questions posed at the beginning of the study.

ACHIEVEMENT OUTCOMES The first evaluation question examined was: "What were the achievement outcomes for the kindergarten, first, and second grade student participants across school sites?" In this study, effect sizes were calculated to measure the impact of the program on student achievement. Effect size is a numerical representation of the impact of instruction on the experimental group relative to the control group. The data clearly showed that the curriculum produced an educationally significant effect 6,7,8 of .33 on the overall skill level of the kindergarten/grade 1 student participants. The sample size is almost twice that necessary for statistical power $p < .05$, as can be seen in Table 3. Table 3 Kindergarten/First Grade Sample Effect=0.33 n Mean SD t p Overall Pretest 540 71.5 35.6 -26.52 <0.0001 Overall Posttest 540 94.3 34.3 Difference 540 -22.8 20.0

The effect achieved for the kindergarten-extracted sample was even greater at 0.44, while the first grade sample remained the same, as presented in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4 Kindergarten Sample Effect=0.43 n Mean SD t p Total Pretest 258 52.1 26.9 -19.77 <0.0001 Total Posttest 258 78.2 33.9 Difference 258 -26.1 21.2

Table 5 First Grade Sample Effect=0.33 n Mean SD t p Total Pretest 282 89.2 33.3 -18.14 <0.0001 Total Posttest 282 109.0 27.2 Difference 282 -19.8 18.3 Difference Between Means -19.8 Similar results were found for second grade students. As can be seen in Table 6 below, an educationally significant effect of .44 was achieved in overall skills from pretest to posttest using the SSRW curriculum.

The sample size is almost 100 more than necessary to provide statistical power for significance at $p < .05$ as can be observed in Table 6. Table 6 Second Grade Overall Sample Effect=0.44 n Mean SD t p Total Pretest 250 47.241 6.615 -13.61 <0.0001 Total Posttest 250 52.034 4.442 Difference 250 -4.793 5.690

These findings from the analysis of the research data are best understood by a brief explanation of the BESD and the conversion of the effect sizes to BESD equivalents. The most striking feature of the BESD representations of the effect size is the different impression they give of the potential practical significance of a given effect from that of the standard deviation unit expression.

For example, an effect size of one-fifth of a standard deviation (.20) corresponds to a BESD success rate differential of .10, that is, 10 percentage points between pretest and posttest success rates (e.g., 55% versus 45%). A success increase of 10 percentage points on a pretest group baseline of 45% represents a 22% improvement in the success rate (10/45). Viewed in these terms, the same intervention effect that might appear minimal in standard deviation units—for our discussion example purpose, a .20—looks potentially meaningful in terms of effect size.

Looking at the BESD for the overall outcomes for kindergarten, first grade, and second grade populations in this summer school pilot study, we find the following intervention impact demonstrated in Table 7. Table 7 Kindergarten/First Grade and Second Grade Binomial Effects Size Differential Samples %Above Mean Pretest %Above Mean Posttest Gain Differential % Kindergarten/ First Grade Overall 42% 57% 15% Second Grade Overall 40% 60% 20%

The results of a BESD of 15%9 from a baseline of 42% is that it represents a 36% gain overall (15/42) for the kindergarten/first grade participants in the summer school program during a four-week period. The BESD gain for the second grade participants is even more marked with a San Francisco Study SSRW Research Compendium 12 20% increase from a baseline of 40%, representing a 50% gain (20/40).

These results demonstrate the importance of more fully understanding evaluation data by utilizing a BESD, previously presented in standard deviation units.

English Language Proficiency Our next evaluation questions results are presented in Tables 8 and 9: "To what extent was the SSRW curriculum effective for the given varying levels of English Language Proficiency?"

Table 8 Kindergarten/First Grade Overall Skills Limited English Students Effect=0.32 n Mean SD t P Total Pretest 169 84.3 35.0 -14.23 <0.0001 Total Posttest 169 105.2 31.0 Difference 169 -20.8 19.0

Table 9 Second Grade Overall Skills Limited English Students Effect=1.71 n Mean SD t P Total Pretest 103 46.816 6.924 -10.35 <0.0001 Total Posttest 103 53.350 2.906 Difference 103 -6.534 6.406 As can be determined from Tables 8 and 9 above, kindergarten/first grade participants with limited English proficiency achieved an educationally significant effect from pretest to posttest of one-third of a standard deviation in four weeks.

However, the results were highly dramatic for the second grade participants with limited English proficiency. From pretest to posttest, their scores changed almost 2 standard deviations during the four- week period. The changes in terms of BESD equivalents are presented in Table 10. Table 10 Kindergarten/First Grade and Second Grade Limited English Participants Binomial Effects Size Differential Samples %Above Mean Pretest %Above Mean Posttest Gain Differential % K/1 Overall 42% 57% 15% Second Grade Overall 17% 82% 65%.

The results of a BESD differential of 15%10 from a baseline of 42% is that it represents a 36% gain overall (15/42) for the kindergarten/first grade participants with limited English proficiency. The BESD differential gain for the second grade participants with limited English proficiency represents a 382% gain (65/17). Next, we examined the pretest and posttest results for the kindergarten/first grade students designated as non-English proficient. There were no second grade participants with this designation to include in the analysis. The scores for this subset group are presented in Table 11 below.

Table 11 Kindergarten/First Grade Non-English Proficiency Effect=0.54 n Mean SD t p
Total Pretest 128 47.9 23.5 -15.28 <0.0001 Total Posttest 128 78.3 32.8 Difference 128 -
30.4 22.5

The sample size for this population subset exceeded the number required for the effect size to be significant at $p < .05$. The BESD equivalent is presented in Table 12.

Table 12 Kindergarten/First Grade Non-English Proficiency Participants Binomial Effect Size Differential Samples %Above Mean Pretest %Above Mean Posttest Gain Differential % K/1 38% 62% 24% The result of a BESD differential of 24% from a baseline of 38% represents a 63% gain (24/38) for the kindergarten/first grade participants with non-English proficiency.

Next, the results for students with proficient or fluent English language skills were examined. Although the sample sizes were too small in these participant subsets for definitive conclusions¹¹ the results trend in the same direction as results for the other student participants overall and in the student subsets: the pretest to posttest effect for the fluent- English K/1 participants is 0.31; the pretest to posttest effect for the English-proficient kindergarten/first grade participants is 0.35; and, the pretest to posttest effect for the English proficient second grade participants is 0.43.

Relevant Demographic Analyses Finally, we were interested in reviewing our last evaluation question: "To what extent was the SSRW curriculum effective across relevant demographic analyses?" We present the findings of curriculum category pretests and posttests for the various student sample populations across school sites in the charts on the following pages.

Kindergarten/First Grade Student Participants, Overall Sample BESD Success Rate
Percentage Gain 0102030405060Letter SoundsBlendingVocabularyOverall Sample
n=540 Letter Sounds Effect Size Blending Effect Size Vocabulary Effect Size Overall
Effect Size K/1 0.34 0.39 0.24 0.33

Kindergarten/First Grade Student Participants, Non-English Proficiency Sample BESD
Success Rate Percentage Gain 0102030405060708090Letter
SoundsBlendingVocabularySentencesOverall Sample n=128 Letter Sounds Effect Size
Blending Effect Size Vocabulary Effect Size Sentences Effect Size Overall Effect Size
K/1 0.37 0.60 0.53 0.43 0.54

Kindergarten/First Grade Student Participants, Limited English Sample BESD Success
Rate Percentage Gain 0102030405060Letter
SoundsBlendingVocabularySentencesOverall Sample n=169 Letter Sounds Effect Size

Blending Effect Size Vocabulary Effect Size Sentences Effect Size Overall Effect Size
K/1 0.35 0.43 0.22 0.25 0.32

Kindergarten/First Grade Student Participants, English Proficient Sample BESD Success
Rate Percentage Gain 0102030405060Letter
SoundsBlendingVocabularySentencesOverall Sample n=121 Letter Sounds Effect Size
Blending Effect Size Vocabulary Effect Size Sentences Effect Size Overall Effect Size
K/1 0.37 0.40 0.22 0.47 0.35

Second Grade Student Participants, Overall Sample BESD Success Rate Percentage Gain
0102030405060Beginning SoundsBlendingOverall Sample n=250 Beginning Sounds
Effect Size Blending Effect Size Overall Effect Size Second Grade 0.20 0.44 0.44

Second Grade Student Participants, Limited English Sample BESD Success Rate
Percentage Gain 0102030405060Beginning SoundsBlendingVocabulary Sample n=103
Beginning Sounds Effect Size Blending Effect Size Vocabulary Effect Size Second
Grade 0.37 0.40 0.22

Second Grade Student Participants, No Proficiency Designated Sample BESD Success
Rate Percentage Gain 0510152025303540Letter ClusterOverall Sample n=119 Letter
Cluster Effect Size Overall Effect Size Second Grade 0.38 0.30

Second Grade Student Participants, English Proficient Sample BESD Success Rate
Percentage Gain 0102030405060Beginning SoundsLetter ClusterOverall Sample n=28
Beginning Sounds Effect Size Letter Cluster Effect Size Overall Effect Size Second
Grade 0.36 0.35 0.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS The goal of this analysis was to determine if a four-week, 80-hour pilot test using the SSRW program as intervention curriculum is effective for elementary populations with various English language proficiencies. The data demonstrate that the intervention produced educationally significant effects for both the kindergarten/first grade and second grade participants overall, produced dramatic effects for students with limited English proficiency overall and across skill subsets, and produced significant effects and beneficial outcomes for participants with normal English language proficiency.

The program appears to be highly promising as a primary curriculum intervention, even for short summer sessions of even four weeks. The program demonstrated effects on curriculum subset skill areas in Letter Sounds, Beginning Sounds, Letter Clusters, Blending, Sentences, and Vocabulary.

Although a variety of teachers and ten different school sites in the San Francisco Unified School District tested the program, there was a very detailed implementation methodology provided for each site. The approach to increase pedagogic consistency in implementing the program across sites may have contributed to the successful outcomes during the concentrated period of time.

These findings corroborate published research on the effectiveness of the SSRW program used for intervention¹² for special at-risk populations and provide additional evidence for effectiveness in focused, short-term programs.

Overall Strength and/or Weaknesses

Disclaimer: Comments on the strengths and/or weaknesses of each book, material or program were written by members of the State Textbook/Instructional Materials Review Team and reflect their opinions. They do not reflect the opinions of the State Textbook Commission nor the Kentucky Department of Education. In addition, the State Textbook/Instructional Materials Review Team completed each evaluation form during summer of 2005. In order to maintain the integrity of the review team's comments, editing was limited to spelling and punctuation.

Recommendations: [The recommendation for Sing, Spell, Read, and Write is for use as supplemental materials. The materials are limited or non existent in the coverage of the Core Content and Program of Studies.](#)

Summary Form

I.	Technology Component Summary	0.000.00
	The Phonics Songs for Levels K and 1 is on a CD. The CD teaches the alphabet and phonics in a song format which is used in conjunction with the student skills books and phonics readers. It does aid in the instruction of the ELL student.	
	The sound CD is the only technology available for student use.	
II.	Reading Content Summary	1.0700000000000001
	Sing, Spell, Read, and Write is a comprehensive phonics program that provides students with experiences in a continual scope and sequence/spiral format. The materials provide students with reinforcement of phonics skills using music, kinesthetic, and auditory modalities.	
	Features such as irony, humor, and organization are not addressed. There were very small and hard to read student page snapshots of the assessment pages in the teacher's edition. Student books were not available for evaluation.	
III.	Writing Content Summary	0.08
	Students are only given optional writing experiences and no instruction in the writing process is included in this material.	
IV.	Grammar and Spelling Content Summary	0.15
	The materials include phonetic instruction only. Grammar rules and usage along with practice is not indicated. Spelling is limited to the student spelling to a partner while the teacher listens and signs off on it.	
V.	Listening /Speaking / Observing Content Summary	0.00
	The materials include phonetic instruction only. Grammar rules and usage along with practice is not indicated.	
VI.	Inquiry Content Summary	0.00
	This is strictly a phonics program and does not offer students opportunities to develop questions or use research tools for authentic tasks.	
VII.	Technology Content Summary	
	The Phonics Songs for Levels K and 1 is on a CD. The CD teaches the alphabet and phonics in a song format which is used in conjunction with the student skills books and phonics readers. It does aid in the instruction of the ELL student.	
	The sound CD is the only technology available for student use.	
VIII.	Audience: Teacher Materials Content Summary	0.58
	A limited Read Aloud list is included in the front of the teacher's editions. The materials do indicate using some of the multiple intelligences.	
	Student pages are in snapshot form but are small and difficult to read.	
IX.	Audience: Student Materials Content Summary	0.33
	The Phonetic Storybooks address specific phonics skills.	
	The student's books only include the selections without questions or activities at the end. The student practice book only allows for writing of the words and reading them to a partner. The only genre for the children to read is fiction.	
X.	Format Content Summary	0.57
	The vocabulary lists in the front of the books are easily accessible for all students.	

There are no dictionaries, appendices, or indexes included in the Phonetic Storybooks. There is no indication of integrated content areas.

- XI. Ancillary Materials Content Summary 0.50
The teacher's edition indicates an overview of each step that includes; objectives, suggested pacing, ELL, materials needed, phonics songs, and additional resources.
Ready Readers and Modern Curriculum Press Phonics Practice are indicated in the Additional Resources but must be purchased from Modern Curriculum Press.
These materials were reviewed as a K-1 set.

READING CONTENT

The phonics skills are taught in levels K-1 using music, poems, chants, and phonics readers. However, the Level K - 1 Student books and Level 1 Phonetic Library and The Assessment Book were unavailable for evaluation. (There were snapshots of the books.)

There are only six decodable phonetic storybooks in the Kindergarten level and seventeen decodable phonetic storybooks in Level 1. The Phonetic Storybooks are reinforcing a particular phonics skills such as short a. The teacher's edition has the Phonetic Storybooks in snapshot form and then asks comprehension and critical thinking questions.

The text has limited connection to the student's background knowledge. However, the student's phonics skills are connected and spiraled throughout each book.

There are higher order thinking skills questions which include picture clue, story detail, drawing conclusions, making inferences, predicting, main idea, and rhyming within the teacher's edition.

Sing, Spell, Read, and Write is a comprehensive phonics program that provides students with experiences in a continual scope and sequence/spiral format.

The materials provide students with reinforcement of phonics skills using music, kinesthetic, and auditory modalities.

The decodable phonetic storybooks address a particular phonics skill such as short e or letter clusters i.e. /th/. The Kindergarten books dedicate a page to the vocabulary words that are in the story along with selected previously introduced words.

Students are asked a variety of questions provided in the teacher's edition.

Students continually work on fluency by reviewing previously learned words that are applicable to the particular storybook. There does not appear to be a formal assessment of the student's fluency.

There are two Achievement Tests that are given after completing Step 15 and Raceway Step 36 for the purpose of evaluating student ability and/or progress in reading skills.

The diagnostic assessment is addressed above and the formative and summative assessments are given at the end of each of the Phonetic Storybooks.

Each book can be used for these types of readings. However, there is a limited list of Read-Aloud Literature for each Curriculum book. These read alouds reinforce letter sounds in the All Aboard, On Track, and Off We Go sections.

The text includes fiction and little indication of other genres.

Students are not given author pages to identify contemporary, classic, and multicultural writers of both genders. These materials were reviewed as a K-1 set.

The Assessment book was unavailable for evaluation. However, there were very small and hard to read student page snapshots of the assessment pages in the teacher's edition. The directions over each phonetic storybook was available in the teacher's edition.

WRITING CONTENT

The materials include only optional writing experiences and do not discuss the writing process. The writing is limited to sentences or drawing pictures.

The writing process model nor discussion is present.

Students are only given optional writing experiences and no instruction in the writing process is included in this material.

Students are given very limited optional opportunities for writing sentences. The sentences are limited to writing a silly sentence or write a sentence or two telling what they think the story might be about or how the story might end.

The students have only optional writing opportunities and no instruction on the writing process or use of correct grammar.

Students are not given instruction in the writing process, grammar, or spelling.
The writing process is not presented in the materials.
Usage and mechanics are not included in the materials.
There are no indications of written or oral language experiences of any type.
Student only have optional writing experiences and these are limited to a few sentences.
The oral language, written language, and media technology are not present.
This is a phonics program only and does not include these components.

GRAMMAR AND SPELLING

The materials include phonetic instruction only. Grammar rules and usage along with practice is not indicated.
Grammar usage in various written and oral modes is not indicated in the materials.
There is no indication of instruction or activities in the writing process.
The materials do not include writing models.
Students may practice spelling orally to a partner while the teacher listens, but there is not indication of spelling lists or formal assessments in spelling.
There is limited differentiated instruction in phonetic skills.
There are no word lists present - not indications for formal assessment.
Spelling words are spelled with a partner but there is not a formal assessment other than a sign off once the student has successfully spelled 29-30 words presented.
The only strategies that are taught are the phonics skills for letter sounds and indicators.
These materials were reviewed as a K-1 set.

LISTENING / SPEAKING / OBSERVING

These materials were reviewed as a K-1 set. The materials include phonetic instruction only. Grammar rules and usage along with practice is not indicated.

INQUIRY

This is strictly a phonics program and does not offer students opportunities to develop questions or use research tools for authentic tasks.
These materials were reviewed as a K-1 set.

TECHNOLOGY CONTENT

The sound CD is the only technology available for student use. However, the CD teaches the alphabet and phonics in a song format which is used in conjunction with the student skills books and phonics readers,
There is no evidence of using technology for communication.

The sound CD is the only technology available for student use.

AUDIENCE: TEACHER MATERIALS

Students are immersed into a phonics program. The program addresses only areas of phonological awareness.
The assessments are multiple choice and either circling or drawing a line under an indicated word given by the teacher. Students are also asked to draw a line to a picture that answers a sentence.
A limited Read Aloud list is included in the front of the teacher's editions.
The materials do indicate using some of the multiple intelligences.
Questions about the storybooks indicated critical thinking skills.
The Phonetic Storybooks are directed at specific phonics skills.
Student pages are in snapshot form but are small and difficult to read.
These materials were reviewed as a K-1 set.

AUDIENCE: STUDENT MATERIALS

The student's books only include the selections without questions or activities at the end. The student practice book only allows for writing of the words and reading them to a partner.
The only genre for the children to read is fiction.
The Kindergarten level contains handwriting practice within the student books.

Diversity within the texts is limited.

There are areas indicated in reading but these are limited to phonemic awareness. Writing process development is not indicated within this program.

These materials were reviewed as a K-1 set.

FORMAT

The teacher materials indicate a scope and sequence within that grade level.

Diversity is reflected in the Phonetic Storybooks but it is limited.

The books are age appropriate in type and spacing.

The softcover books may deteriorate over continued use. The Phonetic Storybooks are limited in number and others would need to be purchased to accommodate a larger group.

These materials were reviewed as a K-1 set.

ANCILLARY MATERIALS

Student pages are shown in small and hard to read snapshot form.

Some of the multiple intelligences are indicated along with appropriate activities for each.

The ESL/ELL students have access to the song CD and in the teacher's editions there are some strategies indicated .

The teacher's edition indicates an overview of each step that includes; objectives, suggested pacing, ELL, materials needed, phonics songs, and additional resources.

Ready Readers and Modern Curriculum Press Phonics Practice are indicated in the Additional Resources but must be purchased from Modern Curriculum Press.

These materials were reviewed as a K-1 set.